MIPIE

Mapping the Implementation of Policy
for Inclusive Education (MIPIE)

Report of the Conference held on
2nd and 3rd December 2010,
Brussels, Belgium

European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education

MAPPING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (MIPIE)

**Report of the Conference held on
2nd and 3rd December 2010, Brussels, Belgium**

A project conducted by the
European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education
with support from European Community
LLP Comenius funding

More information on the Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education project is available at the project website:
www.european-agency.org/agency-projects/mipie

Secretariat	Brussels Office
Østre Stationsvej 33	3 Avenue Palmerston
DK-5000 Odense C Denmark	BE-1000 Brussels Belgium
Tel: +45 64 41 00 20	Tel: +32 2 280 33 59
secretariat@european-agency.org	brussels.office@european-agency.org

www.european-agency.org

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This document presents a detailed report of the first project conference held as part of the Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education (MIPIE) project, conducted by the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (the Agency). The conference was held in Brussels on 2nd and 3rd December 2010, co-hosted by representatives of the Ministries of Education of the Flemish and French speaking communities of Belgium and the Agency.

The Agency is an independent and self-governing organisation, established by the member countries to act as their platform for collaboration in the field of special needs education. The Agency currently has national networks in 27 European countries and is financed by the member countries' Ministries of Education and the European Commission's Lifelong Learning Programme, as one of the 6 institutions pursuing an aim of European interest in the field of education (Jean Monnet Programme).

In Spring 2010, the Agency submitted an application for the Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education (MIPIE) as a project supported under Commission LLP Comenius funding. In the Autumn 2010, the Agency was awarded the grant and the project began in November 2010 under agreement number: 510817-2010-LLP-DK-COMENIUS-CAM.

The Agency member countries involved in the MIPIE project are: Austria, Belgium (Flemish and French speaking communities), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom (England, Scotland and Wales).

MIPIE project outline

Rationale

All countries need to track the implementation of new educational policies and legislation. The justifications and pressures for mapping such developments are very clear at:

- International level (as can be seen in the UN 2006 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities calls for data collection and monitoring at State level);

- European level (as outlined in the Lisbon objectives 2010 and also European Council priorities and targets outlined in the Education and Training 2020 strategy);

- National levels (as evidenced by Agency work involving ministerial representatives from 27 European countries. Please see: www.european-agency.org).

The pressures on policy makers to demonstrate how policies are leading towards greater educational inclusion result in the need for the systematic collection of qualitative and quantitative information that answers key questions and can be used longitudinally by countries to map their own developments and comparatively across countries to compare relative developments.

Various sources of such information relating to mainstream education are already available to policy makers from international organisations such as Eurydice, Eurostat, OECD. In addition, there are initiatives being taken at European level (co-ordinated by Eurostat) to explore specific quantitative data collection relating to special needs education (the EA is actively co-operating with Eurostat in this work).

However, the Agency's work with policy makers in 27 European countries indicates that there are major gaps in the information that is currently available:

- The approaches taken by the organisations working in the field and the type of information they provide differs greatly;

- There is no European level agreed approach to information collection that can be used to map implementation of policy for inclusive (as opposed to special needs) education;

- Quantitative data alone is not enough to map developments in inclusive education – qualitative information must be collected and made available.

Policy makers working in inclusive education suggest that they need to know what qualitative and quantitative information to collect and the best methods of doing this in order to map the implementation of policies for inclusive education. They need to have agreed signposts to track progress towards educational inclusion, which is a clear priority for all EU member states. The goal for this project will be to provide them with clear proposals on Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education.

Target group

The main participants as well as target group for the project are policy makers for inclusive education. The project will work with policy makers nominated by their respective Ministries of Education to act as country representatives within the Agency.

A further group of participants, as well as a further target group for the project, will be national level experts on educational data collection.

These experts will be invited to work with policy makers in formulating proposals relating to the most appropriate methods to be used for meaningful data and information collection for mapping policy implementation for inclusion.

Project aims and activities

The MIPIE project is essentially an information collection and 'scoping' activity. The focus of the project is not to collect any qualitative or quantitative data; rather the goal of the project is to take a first step towards identifying for policy makers what quantitative and in particular qualitative information should be collected and how this can be done in the best way to effectively map the implementation of policy for inclusive education in a meaningful and applicable way.

Specific project objectives will be to work with policy makers from European countries in order to:

- Clarify a rationale for what information needs to be made available for policy makers;

- Identify what information is already available;

- Highlight the gaps in current information;

- Provide detailed proposals on how the necessary information could be collected in the future for the purposes of national, self-mapping and for European level comparative purposes.

The project will run from 1st November 2010 to 31st October 2011.

The main project activities focus upon two conferences – one in Belgium during 2010 and one in Hungary, during 2011 – these are political level events held during the respective

countries' hosting of the Presidency of the EU and organised in co-operation with representatives of the Ministries of Education in the two countries.

These events are the main opportunities for information gathering with the target group for the project – that is decision-makers responsible for the implementation of inclusive education policy in the European countries involved in the project.

Each of the two conferences organised during the project lifetime have clear goals linked to the development of eventual project outputs. This report is such an output and presents a record of the Brussels event.

First project conference – 2nd and 3rd December 2010, Brussels, Belgium

The aim of this conference was to identify what data and detailed information European policy makers need in order to map developments in the implementation of legislation and policy for inclusion.

During the conference in Belgium, policy makers from the participating countries reflected upon their current information collection and current and future requirements – the 'what' of identifying and mapping developments towards inclusive education – and identified key issues, priorities and questions associated with such data collection.

The various sessions and activities covered within the Brussels conference are presented in Annex 1 of this report.

Annex 2 presents an overview of all 40 plus participants in the event.

In the following sections, summaries of information collected during different meeting activities and discussions are presented. These summaries begin with an overview of key messages presented by the speakers involved in the 2-day event.

All of the presentations and background materials from the meeting are available from the MIPIE project area on the Agency's website: www.european-agency.org/agency-projects/mipie

MAIN MESSAGES FROM SPEAKERS' PRESENTATIONS

During the first morning of the Conference in Brussels, there were a number of inputs considering policy issues related to data collection and mapping work. These inputs from representatives of the host Ministries – the Ministries of Education of the Flemish and French speaking communities of Belgium – as well as representatives of key European organisations working in the field of policy mapping for mainstream education – Directorate General for Education and Culture (DG-EAC) and Eurostat – present their priorities and work in this field. These inputs contributed to the debates with national level policy makers held later in the meeting.

The sections below highlight some of the key messages from policy-makers and illustrate aspects of international work currently being conducted that can inform the MIPIE project work.

Messages from the Opening Session

Jean-François Delsarte, presenting on behalf of Minister Marie-Dominique Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium stressed the important but difficult role policy makers must play in promoting inclusive education and: '… of building a future for our youngsters that we welcome in our schools. This is a big challenge, but [by] searching for solutions to them, whilst promoting transparency and respecting all people, we can achieve our goal.'

Wim Van Rompu, Cabinet member of Minister Pascal Smet, Flemish speaking community of Belgium suggested that the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities that calls for data collection and monitoring at State level: 'is a great challenge for all those countries that have already ratified it … we see the Convention as a stimulus for a process of change and development in the field of special needs education.'

He highlighted the implementation of article 33 of the UN Convention, explaining that States must set national focal points in order to monitor the implementation of the Convention: 'States must also set some sort of independent monitoring mechanisms – which usually take the form of an independent national human rights institution. The full participation of civil society, in particular persons with disabilities and their representative organisations is essential in the national monitoring and implementation process. This means that indicators will be needed in order to follow up the process of putting the content of the Convention into real practice.'

He continued: 'In order to do this, measuring the progress in policy implementation is considered to be essential. Aggregate national and European averages often mask regional and local realities … there is a need to examine possible new approaches towards monitoring progress. One way would be to develop and improve reliable and comparable statistical tools. These must lead to better measurement and monitoring educational inequality at national, regional and local level. More attention should be paid to monitoring educational equality in existing progress reports.'

Mr. Van Rompu concluded: 'During the discussions in the Council of Ministers they all agreed upon the importance of monitoring, although there were disagreements about how it should be done. The Flemish Attaché at the Permanent Representation of Belgium to the EU has used the information about the MIPIE project in the preparation of the Council meeting and distributed the information to key people. He will also emphasise the importance of the project in his discussions with the Hungarian and European authorities.

The European Commission has planned a communication for 2011 on *Equity in education and training to support European inclusive growth.* It will open the discussion on measuring progress in breaking the cycle of disadvantage … [the MIPIE project] … connects with issues that are also on the European agenda and the agenda of your Ministers.'

Jørgen Greve, Chairman, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education outlined the justifications and pressures for mapping developments in policy for inclusive education at international, European and nation al levels. He stated the: ' … the Agency's work with policy makers in member countries indicates that there are gaps in the information that is currently available and so the MIPIE project and this conference are first steps to addressing those gaps by identifying proposals agreed by policy makers themselves regarding *what* information is required and *how* they can track and map the implementation of policies or inclusive education in the best ways. This is an ambitious project, but potentially a very important one …'.

Messages from the Panel Session

The opening session was followed by a panel session chaired by *Agency Director Cor Meijer*, providing reflections on mapping education policy from different policy perspectives.

Natalie Verstraete, Head of Unit International Relations, Ministry of Education and Training, Flemish speaking community of Belgium gave an input considering improving policy making through benchmarking in education. She stated: 'If I talk about benchmarking I always start by giving this quote: "*If we cannot measure it, we cannot (im)prove it*" … strategic initiatives such as benchmarking are on the rise, providing policy-makers with valuable information that can help them introduce, change and improve the effectiveness of their policies. The added value of benchmarking in education is recognised more and more within the European Union, other international organisations and across Member States. But benchmarking is also a very sensitive exercise, because a lot of arguments in favour of investments in benchmarking also have a counterargument.'

Ms. Verstraete continued: 'The overarching objective of using benchmarks is to *improve and measure improvement.* Defining certain benchmarks isn't without consequences, because it's a way of putting a topic high on the political agenda. Therefore, it is probably an illusion to think that a completely rational and knowledge-oriented method of policy-making is possible.'

She reflected upon the importance of considering learners with SEN in European level benchmarking and data collection exercises: 'The social dimension is clearly defined in Strategic Objective 3 of the ET2020: promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship. The member States asked the European Commission to develop co-operation on learners with special needs.'

In an input on behalf of Zoltán Gloviczki, Deputy State Secretary for Education, *Zsuzsa Sipkai, Ministry of National Resources, Hungary,* emphasised the importance of improving education though the use of quality assurance procedures. She stated that: 'The Department for Public Education of the Ministry of National Resources is very much in favour of this European Agency initiative. Based on our experiences in strategic planning and educational development there is a vital need for the expected outcomes of this project since policy makers need appropriate input for their work.'

Lars Jakobsen, from the Analysis and Studies Unit, DG-EAC discussed the implementation of the European Commission's open method of co-ordination (OMC). He

described the Education and Training 2020 (ET2020) initiative as being a method of co-operation on policy that is based on:

- Guidelines and common objectives;

- Benchmarks and indicators;

- Learning from each other and sharing of best practices;

- Agenda setting communications;

- Implementation using 'soft law' and peer pressure.

Within the ET2020 strategy there are four overall strategic objectives determined by the Council:

1. Making lifelong learning and mobility a reality;

2. Improving quality and efficiency of education and training;

3. Promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship ;

4. Enhancing creativity and innovation.

He suggested that Strategic Objective 3: *Promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship* was of particular relevance to the MIPE project and its participants: 'Educational disadvantage should be addressed by providing high quality early childhood education and targeted support, and by promoting inclusive education. Education and training systems should aim to ensure that all learners – including those from disadvantaged backgrounds, those with special needs and migrants – complete their education, including, where appropriate, through second-chance education and the provision of more personalised learning.'

He highlighted a number of implementation instruments in relation to the strategic objectives, including monitoring of progress (qualitative and quantitative), evidence and data from European agencies, European networks, international organisations and gathering statistical evidence.

He concluded that: 'The OMC demands a strong evidence base on which to draw policy messages, share best practice and measure progress', but also reminded the conference delegates that: 'Not everything that can be counted counts and not everything that counts can be counted.'

Jean-François Delsarte, Cabinet Member of Minister Marie-Dominique Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium gave an input on planning and monitoring legislation and policy from the national perspective. He began by outlining the complexities of different levels of policy initiatives – international, European, national, regional – that need to be accounted for, particularly within federal countries, such as Belgium. He emphasised the need for 'co-operation agreements' in relation to education policy generally.

In relation to policy for special needs and inclusive education, amongst other issues, the following were highlighted as being critical:

- Different definitions of disabilities and special needs (in particular between different responsible ministries such as Social Affairs and Education);

- No reliable calculated data on the number of pupils with specific needs enrolled in education (except for integration projects);

- No possibility of comparing the existing figures between the different administrative levels.

He concluded that the 2004 decree on specialised and integrated education was modified in 2009 and a permanent group of the General Council of special education was asked to develop proposals to improve the decree as well as possibilities for integration and inclusion in the French speaking community of Belgium.

Messages from the Plenary Inputs

The final session of the morning focussed upon relevant international work in the area of data collection. *Lene Mejer, Eurostat Education, Culture and Science Statistics*, gave the first input describing the current work of Eurostat in relation to the Council request for indicator information in the field. She began by explaining that: 'The Commission Communication of February 2007 and the Council Conclusions on a coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks (May 2007) asked for an indicator related to pupils with special educational needs.'

The Council Conclusions state that: '… data exists, but definitions, composition, data sources, costs and other relevant technical specifications should be clarified.'

Eurostat has made initial investigations regarding the statements of the Council Conclusions and detailed work will begin in 2011. The Eurostat framework has the following starting points:

- The definition from ISCED: the additional resources allocated for pupils with special educational needs. ISCED 1997 text extends SEN coverage to include all groups of pupils if they need 'additional' resources.

- The EU Commission's Progress Report towards the Lisbon objectives in Education and Training – Indicators and Benchmarks has incorporated data from the OECD SEN-DDD project as well as from the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education in the last versions.

- The conclusion that data from the different organisations cannot easily be compared.

- In UOE (UNESCO, OECD, Eurostat data collection on education systems) pupils with SEN are within the data collection scope, but are 'hidden', i.e. not separately identified. The UOE manual, volume 1 states: 'no common definition of "special education" has been adopted by countries so far, and it is difficult to conceive a methodology that would generate consistent and comparable statistics from countries.'

Within the Eurostat Work programme 2011, there are three tasks:

- To assess the existing statistical methodologies and data related to students with special educational needs (SEN) in order to address the priorities of EU Commission and EU Member States' need for SEN statistics.

- To propose that data collection on SEN is integrated in the UOE data collection (i.e. to make this sub-population visible in the existing data collection).

- To suggest and test relevant quantitative indicators on the basis of the UOE data collection and the policy priorities indicated at EU level.

Lene Meijer concluded by describing an enquiry that will be conducted with: ' … actors at international level regarding data and indicator needs in relation to SEN pupils.'

The participants at the Brussels conference were invited to participate in this enquiry.

Serge Ebersold, Professor at INS-HEA, France and MIPIE Project Consultant gave an input on the added value of longitudinal studies involving data collection and analysis. He described a current study focussed upon identifying best transition policies and practices for young disabled people involving a longitudinal study exploring what works and case studies exploring how things work.

He outlined some challenges identified within the longitudinal study that are of relevance for the MIPIE project work:

- Overcoming the lack of data on the situation of students with SEN compared to the general population;
- Identifying the impact of inclusive education;
- Clarifying issues surrounding definitions of disability;
- The impact of cross-sectoral issues.

The presentation emphasised the need for clear and coherent information on the qualitative aspects of educational opportunities for young people and stressed the fact that: 'Equity issues are linked with disability and socio-demographic characteristics.'

Quality in education needs to be examined in relation to:

- Participation opportunities for individuals;
- Achievement pathways and opportunities for success that individuals are able to access through systems and additional resources;
- The continuity and coherence of educational pathways open to individuals;
- The effects of support and opportunities on the development of autonomy, self-reliance and real participation and inclusion in wider society.

Harald Weber, Agency Project Manager presented an overview of the Agency project work focussing upon the development of a set of indicators for the conditions of inclusive education in Europe. He described how: 'Monitoring is an essential part in any "control" system to be able to undergo a continuous process of setting goals, implementing strategies and monitoring whether the stated goals have been achieved … Once available, indicators can be used as "sensors" in this system, helping the short-term users to focus on the relevant aspects in policy and practice.'

The key objective of the project has been to develop a set of indicators for inclusive education to be used by countries for monitoring their own developments in country based policy and practice. However, in essence this work is extremely: '… complicated once you look into the issue.'

The challenges involved in the work include:

- Ensuring the relevance of the framework for each country;
- Covering the policy level and its translation into provision;
- Recognising that inclusive schools are implemented at the classroom level;
- Recognising that policies provide the setting in which innovation at school or classroom level can happen;
- Ensuring that the framework is not too bureaucratic, technical or specific;
- Respecting data collection that already takes place in countries.

Harald Weber concluded that the expected outcomes will include recommendations on a range of quantitative and qualitative indicators to provide guidance on existing data sources and outline how data can be used effectively for developing policy, provision and practice. A key outcome for this work will be a consideration of how data on specific indicators might be collected, shared and managed.

Close co-ordination within the Agency between the MIPIE and indicators project work is seen as essential. This was a point stressed by *Amanda Watkins, Agency Project Manager* who concluded the plenary session with an input describing the Agency's Special Needs Education Country Data collection work.

She stated that the purpose of Agency quantitative data collection is to inform policy makers in SNE; the work aims to support the movement (in policy and practice) away from medically based models of definition, assessment and provision towards educational and 'interactionist' approaches.

It was stressed that: 'this field does not deal with "absolutes". Special Educational Needs (SEN) is a "construction" that countries identify and deal with in different ways.' A number of clarifications regarding quantitative data collection in the area of SNE were presented:

- Special Educational Needs (SEN) is a broader term than disability – it covers more 'types' of need;

- A pupil's special need(s) is a product of the interaction of their abilities and their environment;

- Countries include different 'categories' of learners within SNE provision;

- Current Agency data collection work uses the country based, legal definitions of SEN – there are no accepted definitions of SEN available to use comparatively across European countries;

- The Agency's member countries have agreed that the imposition of 'external' definitions has significant methodological difficulties in practice. There is only one element of statistical data that is comparable – the percentage of pupils in segregated provision (calculated against the overall school population).

The inputs of the various speakers provided a rich source of information and inspiration for the remainder of the conference. Many of the key messages arising from these international level inputs were reflected in discussions between national level representatives – these are presented in the following sections of this report.

The full speeches and presentations of all the inputs are available from the project web area on the Agency website: www.european-agency.org/agency-projects/mipie

COUNTRY INPUTS – SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Prior to the Brussels Conference, all nominated project experts were sent 5 questions they were asked to prepare answers to:

1. What core issues should be covered by qualitative and quantitative data collection on inclusive education?

2. How does existing data address these issues?

3. What type of data is needed to improve the situation? *(from the most necessary to the least necessary)*

4. What challenges have to be overcome to improve the situation? *(from the easiest to the more complex)*

5. How can the project best meet your needs for mapping inclusive education policies?

During group discussion sessions, the experts presented their responses to these questions and then in open debate, the key points agreed by all experts in the group were recorded. These key points were presented during a plenary session on the final morning of the conference.

The text below presents a collation of this overall agreed group feedback in the form of key points linked to each of the original questions.

1. What core issues should be covered by qualitative and quantitative data collection on inclusive education?

- The equal importance of qualitative data and quantitative data;
- Tracking of individual pupils throughout their complete educational career;
- Measuring progress rather than achievement;
- Securing commitment from all who gather data;
- Structural aspects of provision (teachers and other professionals, adapted materials, support services);
- Impact of inclusion on school environment/culture;
- Cost-effectiveness of interventions;
- The right to education – are the rights implemented?
- How is the money spent? Efficiency?
- Does support meet the needs?
- Impact/Outcome/Achievement;
- Data should improve the quality of the educational system (decision-makers, leaders, teachers, etc.);
- The right questions need to be asked to direct data collection and interrogation;
- Common understandings of the subject matter are required;
- Concepts need to be defined – what do we mean by SEN and SNE, learners at risk of exclusion, inclusive education;

- Systematic data gathering for evidenced based policy making is crucial, but data must reflect all stakeholders' views.

2. How does existing data address these issues?

- There is a lot of data based on placements and categories, but limited information about process;

- There is some data available about outcomes and outputs;

- Financial data is available (costs are known);

- Current data is not enough to monitor most of the core issues;

- Some countries (right now) do not have data to answer key questions; others have too much detail in their data – this suggests that sharing methods would be a good idea;

- Countries do not feel that they have the (right) indicators – everybody is missing a part of the required data;

- There are a few answers to a few questions, but no-one has all the answers to all their questions;

- Policy makers get what they ask for … they need to ask the correct questions of the data providers;

- Data that is collected is very focused on numbers … this is not enough.

3. What type of data is needed to improve the situation?

- Data about the process of inclusive education;

- Exact quantitative data on students with SEN is required;

- Non-statistical data, more qualitative data is required. This qualitative data should cover the following aspects of inclusive education:
  o Information about competencies and training for teachers and other professionals;
  o Data about gender, demographic aspects, social background, if required;
  o Data about pupils' experiences in inclusive settings;
  o Data about perceptions, attitudes, etc. from different stakeholders;
  o Data about inclusive cultures in schools.

- Data that tracks students' school careers in inclusive education is required covering the type of support, their learning environments, transition issues;

- Comparable data (nationally, internationally…) is required;

- All country inputs were able to describe the country situations and the challenges, but it is far harder to identify the data needed to answer the key questions.

4. What challenges have to be overcome to improve the situation?

- Cost and bureaucracy;

- Lack of common definitions for data collection;

- Achieving common agreements on purposes of data collection;

- Data protection / privacy issues;

- Ensuring data quality – within and across countries;

- Ensuring full transparency especially when the data is not so positive;

- Making efficient use of existing data and integrating it to the data collection;

- The complexity of the process;

- Individual approach vs. collective data;

- Finding the right 'measurement' tools and data collection instruments;

- Collaboration in terms of data cross-sectoral issues.

5. How can the MIPIE project best meet country needs for mapping inclusive education policies?

- By highlighting informative material for policy makers;

- By identifying good practice in other countries;

- By co-ordinating all the activities of other organisations who deal with data collection (DG-EAC, Eurostat, OECD, etc.);

- By increasing understanding of current development processes in order to see where countries are on their journey towards inclusive education;

- Through a focus on the special needs education approach to overcome the definition issues (resources);

- By identifying the different perspectives that data is needed for;

- By exchange and transfer of good practices on data collection and indicators;

- By providing a common 'European' language for data collection in this area;

- By clarifying that any data gathered must be comparable and be reliable at EU level;

- By clarifying inclusive education is about quality of education and not about placement of pupils with SEN;

- By identifying what data is required on quality education;

- By providing data that can be understood by a range of stakeholders across countries;

- Through data on effectiveness of existing funding systems in countries;

- By supplying evidence based solutions to common problems;

- By recognising the need for clear proposals on qualitative data gathering to support the statistics;

- Through data on educational and non-educational outcomes of pupils in inclusive education;

- Through data that maps the organisation of inclusion as well as the extent of segregation.

SPECIFIC PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY COUNTRIES

In the final plenary discussion, there was a round of inputs from all country representatives. They were asked to answer 3 questions:

1. What is the single most important data collection issue the project should focus on?

2. What sort of data do you need to inform you about this issue?

3. Why is this issue so important within your country context?

24 countries were involved in discussions. The responses are presented in full in Annex 3.

In the text below, all the responses are presented, linked where possible to emerging key themes (indicated in italics).

1. What is the single most important data collection issue to focus on?

Quality in education

- Data that examines quality in education;

- Quality of inclusive education;

- Quality of inclusive education provision and how to improve;

- Quality of provision in different placements – units, inclusive education, special education;

- Data that examines quality in education to guarantee equal opportunities;

- Effectiveness and quality of education.

Data on outcomes of different approaches

- Evidence based arguments on inclusive education or special education;

- If inclusive education and social inclusion is a goal, we need evidence that it is the correct goal and provides better quality experience for pupils;

- Data on whether there are better outcomes for pupils within different educational systems and structures;

- Process information on what happens and what works;

- Pupils' experiences in both inclusive education and special education.

Data on the elements required in inclusive education

- Mapping process – key factors for inclusive education identified;

- Define elements of inclusive education;

- Factors required to build an inclusive education system;

- Type and structure of SNE in inclusive education provision.

Trends in SNE support

- Data on learners and trends in support;

- Number of pupils who are identified with SEN and are getting support.

Data related to the UN Convention 2006

- People with disabilities – in line with CRPD;
- CRPD issues. The quality of education is unknown.

Other issues

- Data on the learning environment and not students;
- Support process and connection between real needs and provision;
- Early school leavers and 2020 goals are an issue;
- School environment including the whole school community;
- Education is too focused on a medical model. NGOs require new and additional SEN categories.

2. What sort of data is needed to inform policy makers about this issue?

Qualitative and quantitative data

- Qualitative and quantitative data is needed;
- Quantitative and qualitative that gives insights into pupils' experiences;
- Quantitative and qualitative – to explore the quality of education. Clear data to be able to make comparative studies;
- Quantitative and qualitative data is required, as both provide explanations;
- Quantitative and qualitative standards for provision and assessment; regular monitoring of the system.

Qualitative data

- Qualitative information that explains how this quality can be achieved;
- Qualitative data – indicators on inclusive education;
- Qualitative information that explains how this guarantee can be achieved;
- Qualitative data on what support is available and how it is given;
- Descriptive qualitative data giving insights into process.

Focus on data identifying quality aspects

- Quality information (i.e. personal experiences) to support numbers;
- Evidence of benefits and quality in inclusive settings;
- Data on key factors of quality education;
- How are systems structured in other countries? Quality factors identified, e.g. pupil experiences and family experiences.

Quantitative data

- Quantitative data as the area needs comparative studies.

Indicators

- Indicators for good practice in inclusive education based on common understanding.

Data focused on teachers and teacher education

- Teaching that is appropriate for inclusion? Training available for inclusive education? Is the curriculum meaningful?

- More information on teacher education for inclusion and confirmation that psychology services are competent;

- Best teacher education for inclusion and student experiences.

Data focused on particular issues

- Effectiveness of existing funding and resource allocations;

- Data that identifies progress of active participation;

- Evidence needed that this is the right way to go;

- How is SNE structured in different countries?

3. Why is this issue so important within country contexts?

Legislation

- New law being evaluated plus parental involvement and choice;

- Legislation and core curriculum changes demand evidence for support based on assessment;

- Country is in the process of decision-making regarding the implementation of CRPD;

- New law needs proof that inclusive education improves the whole school system;

- The new law is now being implemented and evaluated so good data to explore issues of implementation is needed;

- Evaluation of existing legislation needs clear evidence especially information on teacher education for inclusion in pre-school and across all lifelong learning levels;

- The aim of equal opportunities is an aspect of the law and a fundamental principle to be implemented.

Cost issues

- Cost benefit evaluation is needed;

- Efficiency drives are pushing politicians' requests for cutting costs;

- Is the country spending too much on SEN compared to other countries?

- We have no reliable data on this. We know we have a lack of provision but no information on how to develop this in a cost-effective way;

- National trends are towards segregation and specialist provision based on diagnosis. Costs of human capital are arguments against this.

Political issues

- Politicians are arguing about which is best, inclusive education or segregated education;

- Key political issues need to be addressed;

- Court judgment on human rights – a need for consensus on what to do and how much it will cost;
- Central question focuses upon best placement for SEN pupils.

Social arguments

- Education is a question of social welfare not just academic outputs;
- Human rights issue – individualised approaches for all learners.

Data requirements

- Current data collection is raising more questions than answers;
- Good arguments are needed based on data.

Other issues

- Evaluation of teaching practices;
- Needs to be an EU level agreed framework for inclusive education data collection;
- Need for shared understanding on micro and macro level issues;
- Parents are asking for special schools – what are the implications of this for policy?

These priority issues will be used as the basis for discussions between policy makers and data collection experts in the Budapest Conference, March 2011.

REFLECTIONS ON OVERALL MESSAGES FROM THE CONFERENCE

During the 2-day event, the project staff team kept a record of key points emerging in the detailed discussions. These were used alongside information from the various inputs and structured discussion sessions to prepare a number of overall messages emerging from the conference. These key messages can be grouped around five main themes, all of which are identified below.

1. The purpose of data collection as providing evidence of effectiveness

This theme relates to the agreement among policy maker experts participating in the Brussels Conference that all data collection should provide information that ultimately provides evidence about the effectiveness of the education system. Data should address the question of what works and what doesn't work and then support policy makers in making 'hard decisions based on that information'.

Evidence based policy making is crucial and all countries are facing the challenge to move from 'experience based policy making' to policy making that is based upon clear and reliable information.

Data to provide evidence of effectiveness needs to support policy makers in considering:

- Quality assurance issues;
- Cost benefit and 'value for money' issues;
- The impact of change within education systems.

Crucially, data needs to provide evidence that the goals for inclusive education are being reached.

2. The equal value of quantitative and qualitative data

Linked to the theme of the purpose of data, is the question about the type of data required to fulfil this purpose. The policy makers involved in the conference were clear that both qualitative and quantitative data is required to address the complex issues and questions related to the effectiveness of inclusive education.

In the majority of countries, existing data does not answer the questions that policy makers want to know about and improvements in both quantitative data and qualitative data collection are needed. These improvements appear to focus upon identifying:

- More searching and relevant questions for data collection; 'good data' does not necessarily answer the 'right questions';
- More regular and systematic quantitative and qualitative data collection;
- The convergences in existing data collection, especially from research sources in order to identify trends and similar findings from different points of view (i.e. a form of data triangulation);
- Ways of verifying data sources, for example via direct sampling of schools.

Crucially, more detailed and long-term data is required on the outcomes of the education system for individual pupils. This is the focus of the next theme, presented below.

3. Tracking the progress of young people

All the policy makers in the conference stressed that meaningfully tracking the educational 'life histories' of pupils with SEN was a real challenge. Inclusive education should be about

making a qualitative change to all young people's lives, but to 'prove' this it is necessary to map outcomes related to:

- Academic attainments;

- Social relationships and achievements;

- Quality of life issues including self-reliance / autonomy and employment.

Tracking 'educational trajectories' of pupils with SEN means involving schools, pupils, families and other stakeholders in collecting qualitative and quantitative data. Despite the difficulties involved, all conference participants agreed upon the importance of systematic data / evidence collection that presents stakeholders' views and provides insights into learners' experiences of inclusive education.

Such long-term systematic and detailed data collection would, hopefully, also provide insights into the crucial question of how inclusive education supports inclusive societies.

4. The need for national level data collection, within European level agreements

Within the European arena of the Brussels conference, a recurring theme was that of the need for European level agreements on data collection. All policy makers agreed that apparent tendencies within inclusive education are evident across countries and there is a need for clear data on implementation of policy and practice that can be used as inspiration for others.

National level data should be available for EU level comparative work, but for this to be done in a useful and applicable way, there is a need for:

- More clarity on what data should be collected, how, using what techniques and by who at national and European levels;

- A common language for data collection relating to inclusive education at the European level.

Sharing information on methods of data collection, as well as making country information transparent and comparable is seen as a good step forward. However, it is essential that data collection, interpretation and reporting are accessible to a range of different stakeholders.

A recurring issue in debating possible data collection work at the European level is the fact that there is no European definition of the target group. Given each country's own legal definition of SEN, any European level work needs to consider the broad concepts of inclusive education that may lead to a re-interpretation of 'traditional' potential target groups for data collection i.e. those pupils identified as having SEN. For example, within a wider definition of inclusive education, should data collection consider all learners at risk of exclusion, such as migrants, or learners not attending formal education?

Similarly, European level agreements need to be reached on data collection to track inclusive education possibilities across all lifelong learning phases – from pre-school to adult education opportunities.

Any European level data collection should be conducted with two areas of international work in mind:

- The current ISCED revisions;

- The data collection requirements of the 2006 UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

5. Understanding the impact of differences in countries' education systems

Comparative data collection and subsequent interpretation could have the aim of identifying similarities in countries' systems for inclusive education, but it can also have the important aim of illustrating and explaining differences within systems. During discussions, a number of potential areas of impact that occur as a result of differences within educational systems were highlighted as being important for further examination:

- Issues related to the size and population of countries;

- The degree of centralisation or decentralisation in countries' education systems;

- Teacher education as well as training for other education professionals;

- The numbers of pupils with IEPs; the perceived quality of the implementation of IEPs;

- Class size ratios in inclusive education;

- Provision within non-state sector education;

- Issues relating to trends in identification of needs and resource allocation for SEN.

Policy makers for inclusive education value data that can be used to develop an understanding of the impact of differences between approaches taken in different countries.

These themes will be returned to during the Budapest Conference in March 2011 during debates with data collection experts as well as policy makers for inclusive education.

NEXT STEPS IN THE MIPIE PROJECT

Policy makers working in inclusive education suggest they need to know what qualitative and quantitative information to collect and the best methods of doing this in order to map the implementation of policies for inclusive education. The goal for the MIPIE project is to provide these policy makers with clear proposals on Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education.

The focus of the Brussels conference was on *what* information should be collected as well as *why* certain types of data are priorities for mapping purposes.

In the next stage of the MIPIE project, methods of collecting the detailed information that European policy makers need in order to map developments in the implementation of legislation and policy for inclusion will be discussed.

The arena for these discussions will be a second project Conference in Budapest, 9–11 March 2011. During the conference in Budapest, the same policy makers will be involved. In addition, each participating country will nominate a national data collection expert to join the event and all discussions.

These specialists are considered key participants as well as a further target group for the project. Their expertise will inform the debates regarding the *how* or methods for future data collection. It is considered that these experts will be central to future implementation of proposals generated by the project.

Also during the Budapest conference, future priorities for this area of work at European and national levels will be discussed and possibilities for development projects identified.

The outcomes of the Budapest event will be recorded in a Conference Report linked to this document.

Following this conference, the closed project forum will be used to collect further inputs from both groups of participants. Proposals for what qualitative and quantitative data needs to be collected to map policy for inclusive education will be agreed as well as how it can be collected in the most meaningful ways.

Very importantly within the next stages of the project, work will be undertaken to consider a number of the factors highlighted in the group discussions. These relate to the project experts' perceptions about how the MIPIE project can best meet country needs for mapping inclusive education policies. The main suggestions to be accounted for in later stages of the project will include:

i - Highlighting informative material for policy makers, in particular identifying good practice in approaches to data collection;

ii - Increasing understanding of current development processes in order to see where countries are on their journey towards inclusive education;

iii - Working towards a common 'European' language for comparable and reliable data collection in this area at the EU level;

iv - Emphasising that data collection for inclusive education should focus upon quality of education and not on placement of pupils with SEN. This includes identifying what data is required on quality education and ensuring that data can be understood by a range of stakeholders across countries;

v - Co-ordinating all the activities of other organisations who deal with data collection (e.g. DG-EAC, Eurostat, OECD).

Wednesday 1st December

Participants' arrival

19.00   Registration and welcome session

Thursday 2nd December

09.00 – 09.45   Opening Session - welcome and introduction to the topic by:

Presentation Mr. Jean-François Delsarte, on behalf of Minister Marie-Dominique Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium

Mr. Wim Van Rompu, Cabinet member of Minister Pascal Smet, Flemish speaking community of Belgium

Ms. Belén Bernaldo de Quirós, Head of Unit Jean Monnet programme, partnerships and relations, DG-EAC

Mr. Jørgen Greve, Chairman, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education

09.45 – 10.30   Panel Session – Reflections on mapping education policy from different perspectives:

Ms. Natalie Verstraete, Head of Unit International Relations, Ministry of Education and Training, Flemish speaking community of Belgium: *Improving policy making through benchmarking in education*

Presentation Ms. Zsuzsa Sipkai, on behalf of Mr. Zoltán Gloviczki, Deputy State Secretary for Education, Ministry of National Resources, Hungary: *Improving education though the use of quality assurance procedures*

Mr. Lars Jakobsen, Analysis and Studies Unit, DG-EAC: *Implementing the open method of co-ordination*

Mr. Jean-François Delsarte, Cabinet Member of Minister Marie-Dominique Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium: *Planning and monitoring legislation and policy*

     10.30 – 11.00   Coffee

11.00 – 12.30   Plenary Inputs – Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education:

Ms. Lene Mejer, Eurostat Education, Culture and Science Statistics: *The current work of Eurostat in relation to the Council request for indicator information in the field*

Mr. Serge Ebersold, MIPIE Project Consultant: *The added value of longitudinal studies involving data collection and analysis*

Mr. Harald Weber, Agency Project Manager: *The Agency Indicators for Inclusive Education project work*

Ms. Amanda Watkins, Agency Project Manager: *The Agency Special Needs Education Country Data collection*

The MIPIE Project Team: *Overview of the project aims and objectives*

Open time for questions to the presenters

> *12.30 – 14.00   Lunch*

14.00 – 14.15   *Short plenary session – introducing the country presentation sessions*

14.15 – 15.45   Country Presentations
In three discussion groups, nominated representatives of the participating countries will give short inputs on key data collection issues from their national perspectives

> *15.45 – 16.15   Coffee*

16.15 – 17.30   Country Presentations (continued)

> *17.30   Close*

Friday 3rd December

09.30 – 10.30   Plenary Session – feedback on initial themes emerging from country presentations and discussions

> *10.30 – 11.00   Coffee*

11.00 – 12.15   Plenary Discussion – Emerging priorities for mapping policy for inclusive education

12.15 – 12.30   Plenary Input – Introducing the Budapest Conference, Spring 2011

> *12.30   Close of Conference*

ANNEX 2 – CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Opening Session speakers

Mr. Jean-François Delsarte, Cabinet Member of Minister Marie Dominque Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium (presenting on behalf of Minister Marie-Dominique Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium)

Mr. Wim Van Rompu, Cabinet member of Minister Pascal Smet, Flemish speaking community of Belgium

Ms. Belén Bernaldo de Quirós, Directorate General Education and Culture

Mr. Jørgen Greve, Chairman, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education

Panel Session speakers

Ms. Natalie Verstraete, Head of Unit International Relations, Ministry of Education and Training, Flemish speaking community of Belgium

Ms. Zsuzsa Sipkai, Ministry of Education (presenting on behalf of Mr. Zoltán Gloviczki, Representative of the Ministry of Education, Hungary)

Mr. Lars Jakobsen, Directorate General Education and Culture

Mr. Jean-François Delsarte, Cabinet Member of Minister Marie Dominque Simonet, French speaking community of Belgium

Plenary Session speakers

Ms. Lene Mejer, Eurostat

Mr. Serge Ebersold, Project External Consultant

Mr. Harald Weber, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education

Ms. Amanda Watkins, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education

Representatives of the European Union Institutions

Ms. Marta Villar, Council Representative

Ms. Ana Magraner, Directorate General Education and Culture

Ms. Sogol Noorani, Eurydice

Representatives of international organisations

Ms. Natalia Tokareva, UNESCO Institute for Information Technology in Education, Russia

Representatives of the Ministry of Education and Training, French speaking Community of Belgium

Ms. Claudine Louis

Country Representatives

	NAME	ROLE
Austria	Ms Dominika Raditsch	Policy Expert
	Ms Sara Magdalena Ablinger	Aide to Ms. Raditsch
Belgium (Flemish speaking community)	Ms Ann Van Driessche	Policy Expert
Belgium (French speaking community)	Mr Jean-François Delsarte	Policy Expert
Cyprus	Mr Andreas Theodorou	Policy Expert
Czech Republic	Mr Ondřej Zavadil	Policy Expert
Denmark	Mr Preben Siersbæk	Policy Expert
Estonia	Ms Tiina Kivirand	Policy Expert
Finland	Ms Pirjo Koivula	Policy Expert
France	Ms Sylvie Le Ladier	Policy Expert
Germany	Ms Christine Pluhar	Policy Expert
Greece	Ms Maria Michaelidou	Policy Expert
Hungary	Ms Anikó Orbán	Policy Expert
Iceland	Mr Gudni Olgeirsson	Policy Expert
Ireland	Ms Teresa Griffin	Policy Expert
Latvia	Ms Mudite Reigase	Policy Expert
Lithuania	Ms Regina Labiniene	Policy Expert
Luxembourg	Mr Gilbert Steinbach	Policy Expert
Malta	Mr George Borg	Policy Expert
Netherlands	Mr Frederik van Winkelen	Policy Expert
Norway	Ms Idun Klette Låhne	Policy Expert
Portugal	Ms Filomena Pereira	Policy Expert
Slovenia	Ms Bojana Globacnik	Policy Expert
Spain	Ms Milagros López-Salvador Díaz	Policy Expert
Sweden	Mr Lars-Åke Larsson	Policy Expert
Switzerland	Ms Beatrice Kronenberg	Policy Expert
United Kingdom (England)	Mr Andre Imich	Policy Expert

Agency MIPIE Project Team

Project Consultant	
Mr Serge Ebersold	Project External Consultant
Project Steering Group	
Mr Theo Mardulier	Agency Representative Board member
Ms Thérèse Simon	Agency Representative Board member
Mr Patrick Beaufort	Agency National Co-ordinator
Ms Zsuzsa Sipkai	Hungarian Ministerial Representative
Agency Staff Team	
Ms Amanda Watkins	Project Adviser
Mr András Lénárt	Project Officer
Ms Tina Poulsen Hansen	Administrative Co-ordinator
Ms Laura Vesajoki	Project Assistant

ANNEX 3 – IDENTIFIED COUNTRY PRIORITIES

In the final plenary discussion, there was a round of inputs from all country representatives. They were asked to answer 3 questions:

1. What is the single most important data collection issue the project should focus on?

2. What sort of data do you need to inform you about this issue?

3. Why is this issue so important within your country context?

These are the replies from the countries participating in this session:

Austria

1. Quality of inclusive education.

2. Effectiveness of existing funding and resource allocations.

3. Good arguments needed based on data.

Belgium (Flemish speaking community)

1. People with disabilities – in line with CRPD.

2. Data that identifies progress of active participation.

3. Central question in Flanders focuses upon best placement for SEN pupils.

Cyprus

1. Quality of inclusive education provision and how to improve.

2. Best teacher education for inclusion and student's experiences

3. New law being evaluated plus parental involvement and choice.

Czech Republic

1. Factors required to build inclusive education system.

2. Quantitative and qualitative standards for provision and assessment; regular monitoring of the system.

3. Court judgment on human rights – a need for consensus on what to do and how much it will cost.

Denmark

1. Early school leavers and 2020 goals are an issue.

2. Evidence needed that this is the right way to go.

3. Denmark trends towards segregation and specialist provision based on diagnosis. Cost of human capital is an argument against this.

Estonia

1. Pupils' experiences in both inclusive education and special education.

2. Quality information (i.e. personal experiences) to support numbers.

3. Politicians arguing about which is best, inclusive education or segregated education.

Finland

1. Support process and connection between real needs and provision.

2. Qualitative data on what support is available and how it is given.

3. Legislation and core curriculum changes demand evidence for support based on assessment.

Germany

1. Type and structure of SNE in inclusive education provision.

2. How is SNE structured in different countries?

3. Germany is in the process of decision-making regarding the implementation of CRPD.

Greece

1. Quality of provision in different placements – units, inclusive education, special education.

2. Teaching that is appropriate for inclusion? Training available for inclusive education? Is the curriculum meaningful?

3. Evaluation of teaching practices.

Hungary

1. School environment including the whole school community.

2. Need data on key factors of quality education.

3. Education is a question of social welfare not just academic outputs.

Iceland

1. If inclusive education and social inclusion is a goal, we need evidence that it is correct and provides better quality experience for pupils.

2. Evidence of benefits and quality in inclusive settings.

3. Human rights issue – individualised learning for all learners.

Ireland

1. Data on whether there are better outcomes for pupils within different educational systems and structures.

2. How are systems structured in other countries? Quality factors identified, e.g. pupil experiences and family experiences.

3. Cost benefit evaluation is needed.

Latvia

1. Effectiveness and quality of education.

2. Quantitative and qualitative data is required as both provide explanations.

3. Efficiency drives are pushing politicians' requests for cutting costs.

Lithuania

1. CRPD issue. The quality of education is unknown.

2. Quality information on both.

3. Key political issues need to be addressed.

Luxembourg

1. Process information on what happens and what works.

2. Descriptive qualitative data giving insights into process.

3. New law needs proof that inclusive education improves the whole school system.

Malta

1. Data on learners and trends in support.

2. Quantitative and qualitative – to explore quality of education. Clear data is needed to be able to make comparative studies.

3. Needs to be an EU level agreed framework for inclusive education data collection.

Netherlands

1. Number of pupils who are identified with SEN and are getting support.

2. Quantitative as the area needs comparative studies.

3. Is the country spending too much on SEN compared to other countries?

Norway

1. Mapping process – key factors for inclusive education identified.

2. More information on teacher education for inclusion and confirmation that psychology services are competent.

3. We have no reliable data on this. We know we have a lack of provision but no information on how to develop this in a cost effective way.

Portugal

1. Data that examines quality in education.

2. Qualitative information that explains how this quality can be achieved.

3. The new law for Portugal is now being implemented and evaluated so good data to explore issues of implementation is needed.

Regarding point 3: a 2-year external follow-up evaluation of the implementation of the new law and the use of the ICF-CY on the eligibility process for special education is being conducted.

Slovenia

1. Education is too focused on a medical model. A country NGO requires new and additional SEN categories.

2. Qualitative data – indicators on inclusive education.

3. Evaluation of existing legislation needs clear evidence especially information on teacher education for inclusion in pre-school across all lifelong learning levels.

Spain

1. Data that examines quality in education to guarantee equal opportunities.

2. Qualitative information that explains how this guarantee can be achieved.

3. The aim of equal opportunities is an aspect of the Organic law of Spain and a fundamental principle to be implemented. The Organic Law of Education (2006) is the legal framework to provide and assure the right to education.

Sweden

1. Data on the learning environment and not students.

2. Indicators for good practice in inclusive education based on common understanding.

3. Need for shared understanding on micro and macro level issues.

Switzerland

1. Define elements of inclusive education.

2. Qualitative and quantitative data is needed.

3. Current data collection is raising more questions than answers.

UK (England)

1. Evidence based arguments on inclusive education or special education.

2. Quantitative and qualitative data that gives insights into pupils experiences.

3. Parents are asking for special schools – what are the implications of this for policy?

ANNEX 4 – MEETING FEEDBACK SUMMARY

Feedback forms were distributed to the participants after the MIPIE Brussels conference. In all 18 forms were returned by experts. This represents two thirds of the total of 27 nominated experts who took part in the meeting. The results are summarised below. Comments are reproduced as stated on the feedback forms.

Not all respondents answered all options and in one case, one respondent indicated two possible options to the same question.

Aspects of the meeting	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
Usefulness of materials sent out in advance of the meeting	8	10			
Practical organisation of the meeting	18				
Organisation of the working sessions	16	3			
Focus of small group discussion tasks	10	7	1		
Quality of the venue	11	5	2		
Opportunities for networking	10	6	1		
Quality of materials available at the meeting	9	9			
Meeting content as a support for the activities of the overall project	9	7	1		

Responses/reflections:

1. What was your impression of the general structure of the programme; balance of input/discussions, timing of sessions, etc.
- *In my opinion it was good prepared. The central structure and the system of our working in session was very nice built so you could reach very good outcomes in short time it reminded me one game.*
- *Very professional and well organised.*
- *It was well prepared.*
- *It was very useful and well structured, I think.*
- *Just right.*
- *Very well organised.*
- *Clear structure, …, good inputs.*
- *There could be less plenary session/presentation on the first day and more use the time to discuss in working groups because … going deep into the material and changing experiences.*
- *The plenary session were very good, they were not too long and the presentations were good. The translation was also very good. It was easy to understand the speakers and their point of view.*
- *1st morning was too long. Needed more …*
- *Discussion were very balanced, all representatives were given enough time and chance to … their view.*
- *Very good.*

- *Very good.*
- *We need information about the country content for better/deeper discussion and dialogue. We don't have common conceptual understanding of terms.*
- *Very good.*

2. Do you feel that outcomes set prior to meeting were fulfilled? If not, why not?
- *Yes, I was surprised how all these members had open mind that is not so common in my country.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes.*
- *Achieved – very interesting discussions.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes.*
- *Mostly – but not enough specificity/but too general.*
- *To be honest I have mixed feelings but I do think that it was important to have had such a meeting.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes, I do.*
- *In the end: Yes.*
- *Yes.*

3. Are there areas of content which could be further developed, or are there follow up activities that could be planned in the future?
- *I don't think that we have forgotten anything important issues.*
- *More feedbacks on previous issues which raised questions.*
- *Progress issue of inclusive education + segregated education + what is one key indicator + setting more appropriate for the child.*
- *Yes.*
- *It would be good to know good practices of qualitative data collection.*
- *The group activity.*
- *There are other activities planned but there are … which could further developed.*
- *The focus on qualitative data using qualitative information to explain quantitative data. To agree on qualitative data would be difficult on European level.*
- *The content of the countries educational system in very short way.*

4. What did you find the most useful aspects of the meeting and why?
- *I saw that we, I mean in our department, aren't alone and that we are not the 'extremist', who are we often called.*
- *Activities in groups.*
- *The large possibility to now the opinion of the members.*
- *Listening to colleagues experiences.*
- *Group work.*
- *Exchange with colleagues.*
- *The common understanding of the necessity to collect data and the need of comprehensible and reliable data.*
- *More opportunity to talk to each other in structured settings.*
- *The sessions were important and have … information for the project but the group discussions were of utmost important as we could discuss … conference issues.*
- *Group discussion.*

- *Discussion.*
- *The collaboration with the international organisations and referring to Agency projects.*
- *The dialogue about the terms, What? and Why?*
- *Discussion panel and interaction between policy makers.*

5. Have you any suggestions for improving organisation/content of future Agency meetings?

- *In the working groups I think that you could divide the group to 5 small groups (I mean the number of questions) and in each group they could do the summary of all country p. of one question. I think that is easier for you.*
- *Barrier free communication.*
- *More content based discussion prepared in small groups.*
- *As all Agency meetings this was excellently organised.*
- *Agency meetings are always well organised.*
- *Barrier free communication.*
- *None.*
- *No, I haven't.*
- *No.*

Further remarks/comments:
- *Thank you for perfect meeting and organisation and I'm sorry for my mistakes.*
- *For discussions more time (1 more night) and a little spare time.*
- *Keep up the excellent standard of meetings.*
- *Thank you for your useful work.*
- *No.*

Mapping the Implementation of Policy for Inclusive Education (MIPIE) is a project conducted by the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education with support from European Community LLP Comenius funding under agreement number: 510817-2010-LLP-DK-COMENIUS-CAM.

This document is a full report of the first project conference - held in Brussels on 2nd and 3rd December 2010, co-hosted by representatives of the Ministries of Education of the Flemish and French speaking communities of Belgium and the Agency.

More details on the MIPIE project can be found via: http://www.european-agency.org/agency-projects/mapping-the-implementation-of-policy-for-inclusive-education